For the Northern District of California

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1			
2			
3			
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
6			
7	PACIFIC CENTURY INTERNALTD,	ATIONAL	No. C-11-02533-DMR
8	Plaintiff,		ORDER OF CLARIFICATION
9	·		
10	V.		
11	DOES 1-101,		
12	Defendant(s).		
13			

In light of the confusion expressed by Plaintiff in its Motion to Shorten Time on Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint [Docket No. 9] and its Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint [Docket No. 8], the court hereby construes the confusion as a motion for clarification with respect to this court's Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application for Leave to Take Expedited Discovery in Part; Severing Doe Defendants from Case; and Ordering Dismissal of Their Claims. [Docket No. 7.] The court thus hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification.

Throughout the court's order, the court explicitly stated, as well as logically implied, that Doe 101 was SEVERED from the case and the claims against Doe 101 DISMISSED without **prejudice**. The exclusion of Doe 101 in the final section of the order was merely a scrivener's error.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 13, 2011

DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge

SO ORDEREI